Amended Claims With Mark-ups to Show Changes Made

22. (Amended) A multi-stacker for an IC (integrated circuit) handler, comprising:

a guide frame;

a movement plate configured to move upward and downward within the guide frame; [and]

a plurality of tray plates stacked on the movement plate and configured to move upward and downward within the guide frame, wherein each of the [movement] tray plates is configured to receive a tray holding a plurality of semiconductor devices; and

at least one stopper mechanism which is configured to prevent one or more tray plates from being lowered as the movement plate moves downward in the guide frame.

24. (Amended) The multi-stacker of claim [23] 22, wherein the at least one stopper mechanism comprises:

a blocking protrusion configured to engage a side edge of one of the plurality of tray plates; and

an actuator coupled to the blocking protrusion and configured to move the blocking protrusion into and out of a path of travel of the plurality of tray plates as the plurality of tray plates move upward and downward.

REMARKS

Claims 10-22 and 24-29 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 23 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 22 and 24 are amended. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner's comments have been addressed in amending independent claim 22. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 10-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee"), U.S. Patent No. 5,415,519. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action stated that "Lee et al. disclose a multi-stacker 14 including stacker frame 20,22, guide frame 20,22 and movement plate 54" and that "Fig. 6 of Lee et al. show tray plates 15 stacked on the movement plate 54." However, Lee discloses an upstacker and orientation collator 14. The Lee device 14 receives disks 15 onto a tray 54, which are then stacked into a stacking bin 80 positioned *above* the tray 54. A stacking frame 20 with shelves 22 and 24 support the plate 54, the drive mechanism (see, for example, Fig. 2) for the plate 54, and the stacking bin 80. See, for example, Figures 1-2 and 4-6 of Lee. See, also, the abstract and col. 3, line 57, though col. 5, line 51 for the operation of the Lee device.

Thus, with respect to independent claim 10, Lee does not disclose or suggest a guide frame positioned *below and coupled to a bottom of the stacker frame*, as well as a movement plate

configured to move upward and downward *within the guide frame.* The Examiner refers to elements 20, 22 as the stacker frame and elements 20, 24 as the guide frame. However, the plate 54 moves into the stacker bin 80 to position disks 15 therein, which is positioned above elements 20, 22, 24. Further, Lee does not disclose or suggest a plurality of tray plates stacked on the movement plate and configured to move upward and downward within a guide attached to the guide frame and within the stacker frame. Rather, Lee discloses only disks 15 which are positioned on plate 54, one by one, and stacked, one by one, into the stacker bin 80 positioned above the frame 20 and shelves 22, 24.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 10 over Lee should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 11-21 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 10, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

With respect to independent claim 22, Lee does not disclose or suggest a plurality of tray plates stacked on the movement plate and configured to move upward and downward within the guide frame, wherein each of the tray plates is configured to receive a tray holding a plurality of semiconductor devices, as well as at least one stopper mechanism which is configured to prevent one or more tray plates from being lowered as the movement plate moves downward in the guide frame. As discussed above, Lee discloses only disks 15 which are positioned on plate 54, one by one, and stacked, one by one, into the stacker bin 80 positioned above the frame 20 and shelves 22, 24.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 22 should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 24-29 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent

claim 22, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. For all the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-22 and 24-29 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carol L. Druzbick**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128
Carol L. Druzbick
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 JCE:CLD/ms/kam
Date: April 7, 2003